

Resurrection, Change, and Rapture

By Ed Stevens -- Kansas City Conference -- June 5, 2011

© Copyright by Edward E. Stevens. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

A. In this lesson we will be looking at the resurrection of the dead at AD 70. There are three basic Preterist approaches to the Resurrection issue:

- (1) **Collective Body View (CBV)** -- All resurrection texts, as far as they know, are strictly concerned with the Collective Body Resurrection, and none are talking about the kind of individual body we get at death in which to live in heaven after we physically die. They believe these texts are talking about some kind of spiritual or covenantal resurrection of a collective body of saints out of dead Judaism into the New Covenant life of the Kingdom.
- (2) **Individual Body View (IBV)** -- All resurrection texts, as far as this view is concerned, are strictly concerned with a new individual immortal body which is not the self-same mortal body that returns to dust, except in the case of Jesus (whose body was never corrupted by sin and therefore could be maintained). We believe that the disembodied souls of the saints were raised out of Hades and given their new immortal bodies, all of which occurred in the unseen realm.
- (3) Some texts teach either or both views.

My approach follows number three, even though I lean heavily in the direction of the Individual Body View in most resurrection texts. There certainly may be some texts which follow a collective body approach. However I do not see the collective body concept as the only way to interpret those texts. It could just as easily be explained as a resurrection of a bunch of individuals, each of whose individual disembodied **souls** are raised up out of Sheol, and then given a new individual immortal **body**. All the dead ones who were a part of True Israel (the collective body) were individually raised out of Hades and given new immortal bodies. There may also be some other resurrection texts which have additional typological, covenantal, spiritual, redemptive, or positional "in Christ" connotations attached to them, without denying or excluding the individual bodily implications. This would mean that there is a BOTH/AND situation, not an either/or.

B. We need to emphasize here that the IBV is in agreement with the ideas of covenantal change and spiritual resurrection-reigning (raised with, reigning with) during the transition period. It is not an EITHER/OR view. We take a BOTH/AND approach to that. But the spiritual and covenantal resurrection-reigning during the transition period is not the same thing as the final resurrection that occurred only at the Parousia, nor is it the same reign as the eternal reign of Christ with the Father which only began at the Parousia.

C. There is a lot of agreement among Preterists in regard to the resurrection. In fact, I would suspect, after all the dust settles from our debates and discussions, we will find that most of us agree more than we disagree. Here are some things about the resurrection that I believe most of us Full Preterists can agree with:

- Timing of the resurrection (at the Parousia in AD 66-70)
- Resurrection is the event which consummated our Redemption, and once-for-all broke the power of Death that descended upon mankind because of Adam's sin.
- The transition period Christians had **"died with"** Christ, were **"buried with Him"**, **"raised with Him"**, **"seated with Him"**, and **"reigning with Him"** in some sense. That was certainly some kind of resurrection, and it certainly showed that they were God's people and that He had redeemed them and given them a pledge, down-payment, or earnest of their inheritance. But it was not the full inheritance of the Heavenly realm in their new immortal bodies. That fullness would only come at the Parousia. And both the living and dead saints would inherit it at the Parousia, and it would be the same inheritance given to all those who were in Christ, whether living or dead.
- We use the same list of Old Testament prophecies about resurrection and gathering to apply to the New Testament resurrection texts.
- The resurrection not only showed that Christ had redeemed humanity from its condemned status at the Cross, but it brought the dead out of Hades, and restored the dead saints from every nation (both Jews and Gentiles) to the real promised land (heavenly country) that God had promised to all God's people.
- The resurrection of the dead is rightly considered by all Christians (Futurist and Preterist) to be fundamental to our faith and our hope, because if there is no life in heaven with God after this life in the flesh is over, then we of all men are most to be pitied for failing to *gratify our flesh to the max* during our short life on earth. If there is no life after death, then we had better *party hearty* while we can.
- So, being a Preterist does not change our hope for an afterlife in heaven with Christ in an immortal body. We have the same hope that futurists do. The only difference is that they think they have to wait in Hades until the Second Coming, but we Preterists believe we get our new bodies and life in heaven immediately after we die. Which hope is better? A deferred hope, or a fulfilled hope?
- Those are just a few examples of resurrection ideas with which most Full Preterists are in agreement.

D. The differences among the various resurrection views within Preterism comes to the surface when we discuss the NATURE of fulfillment, and how we interpret the individual resurrection texts, especially 1 Cor. 15; 2 Cor. 5; Phil. 3:21; 1 Thess. 4:13-18; Rom. 8; and Rev. 20.

E. When we talk about resurrection, we are automatically dealing with the Plan of Redemption. According to the Bible, that redemptive plan was formulated in the mind of God before He created the world. When Adam and Eve sinned, God did not toss his original plan and start over. He knew all along what was going to happen. There were no surprises, and no changes in plan. To suggest a change in plan would be an attack on the foreknowledge and omniscience of God.

- I suspect that one of the reasons we sometimes come to different conclusions about the interpretation of these resurrection texts is because we are each approaching them from a different redemptive paradigm.
- In other words, we differ on the interpretation of the LAST THINGS, because we differ on our understanding of the FIRST THINGS.
- The way we define the **Death** of Adam in Genesis 3 will determine the way we understand the **Resurrection** in the New Testament.
- Therefore, if we want to understand the Resurrection, we must first make sure we understand the Death in Genesis.
- Every theologian knows that his theological system must be built on a solid interpretation of Genesis 3, or it is just a house of cards built on a foundation of shifting sand.
- That is where all theologies of the Resurrection must start: at the beginning, in Genesis, where Death first appeared as the ultimate enemy of mankind.
- We absolutely must know what kind of DEATH was threatened against mankind, and what kind of DEATH they actually died on the day they ate the forbidden fruit.
- So, we will begin our study of the **resurrection** by looking at the **death** which had to be conquered by the resurrection.

I. WHAT KIND OF DEATH?

1. **Adam's Original Condition at Creation** -- created neither mortal nor immortal, but with the possibility of becoming either, depending on his obedience. He was not created mortal in the sense that he was already subject to death and already destined to die. He would only become mortal if he ate from the forbidden fruit. Nor was he already immortal, because immortality is not something you can lose. Once you have it, you cannot lose it. Adam was capable of sinning and dying, so he was not immortal at his creation. We need to define what mortality and immortality are. Mortality means both subject to death and destined to die. Immortality means not subject to death and unable to die. In the case of Jesus before the Cross, he said that he had life within himself, no one could take his life from him. He could lay it down and pick it back up. No other human being could make that claim. Because he was sinless, he was never subjected to death. The only way he could ever die was if He himself laid his life down of his own initiative. No one could take his life from him. He was not mortal, because he was not subject to death. Instead, he was immortal in the sense that he could not die unless he chose to die.
2. **The Ultimate Destiny of Mankind** was always to go to heaven, even before Adam and Eve fell into sin in the Garden. If they had not sinned, they would not have died physically. Instead, they would have finished out the days of their probationary test in the Garden, and then be changed into their immortal form, and be taken to heaven to live with God forever. Enoch was an example of what would have happened to Adam if he had passed the test. They would have been changed and taken to heaven without suffering physical death.
3. **The Tree of Life and the Probationary Test** -- They were told that they could freely eat of all the trees in the Garden, including the Tree of Life, except for the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. This implies that they ate from the Tree of

Life on a daily or regular basis. These three verses (Gen. 2:9, 16 and 3:2) show that they were commanded to "eat freely" from it every day if they wished. There is nothing here stating or even implying that it was only a one-time eating. Instead, it was the regular eating of it which would have sustained their physical health and longevity until the probationary test would have been finished. But they fell into sin long before the test was complete. If they had remained in the Garden and continued eating from the Tree of Life after they sinned, it would have sustained their physical life forever in a spiritually fallen and separated condition. That is why they had to be removed from the garden. And that removal from the Garden would force them to eventually succumb to physical death.

4. **What kind of death was threatened?** Both physical death and ultimately the second death, unless a redeemer (the Son of Adam) died in their place. How do we know that physical death was actually threatened by God? It is obvious from the conversation between Satan and Eve that she understood the threat as physical death. Where did she get that idea? From Adam. Where did Adam get it? From God. Also, Jesus crushed the serpent's head by dying physically to atone for their sin. His physical death on the Cross as the substitute for Adam and Eve would make little sense if the death threatened against Adam and Eve did not at least include physical death. Furthermore, as we will see shortly, we can know that physical death was included in the threat, because Adam and Eve actually did die physically "on that day" when they ate from the forbidden fruit.
5. **How did they die physically "on that day"?** - When God killed a sacrificial animal to provide skins for them to cover their nakedness, that sacrificial Lamb died in their place. They "died with" that lamb on that day, and "put on" the skin of that lamb to cover their guilt and shame. They also died spiritually, covenantally, or judicially in the sense that they were now condemned, separated, and mortal (subject to death and destined to die). All humanity who were in the loins of Adam at that point "died with Adam" on that day. When the lamb died physically on that day, they "died with" it, just like we "die with" Christ on the day of our conversion. They "put on" the skins of the sacrificial lamb in the same way we "put on" Christ in our conversion, which pointed forward to the time when we will "put on" our new immortal bodies and go to heaven. We can only imagine the horror that gripped the emotions of Adam and Eve as they watched God slay the sacrificial lamb in front of them. They saw the death tremors of the sheep, as the last drops of blood spurted out of its veins, and it died. Adam and Eve "died with" that lamb on that very day. They knew that the death which the lamb suffered was what they themselves deserved. The innocent lamb died in their place. They were now fully mortal (subject to death, and destined to die physically). Their souls would go to Sheol or Hades, and their bodies would return to dust permanently. Someday, at the time of the End when the Son of Adam would crush the serpent's head, God would raise their disembodied souls out of Sheol and give them new immortal bodies, with which to live in heaven with Him. The skin of the lamb pointed to their new immortal bodies which God would provide through the death of His sacrificial lamb, the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. God provided the Lamb, His own dear Son, just like he provided the ram to Abraham on Mount Moriah. When we "die with" Him and "put on" the garments of Christ, we are given hope of

life in heaven with a new immortal body like Christ's. Our old bodies return to dust permanently and God gives us new bodies. The New Testament uses all this language in reference to Christ, implying that He fulfills the original lamb typology.

6. **The Protoevangelium (Gen. 3:15)** -- God promised a redeemer, and the sacrificial system was instituted on that very day to bear witness to the coming Son of Adam who would be the Lamb of God to take away the power of sin and death. They "died with" that lamb "on that day," and thus began the redemptive drama through the substitutionary sacrifice system. Adam and Eve still had to die physically, but a human substitute would come to actually die in their place and give them real covering for their spiritual nakedness and the very kind of immortal body that they needed to live in heaven with God. That sacrificial lamb was also prefigured in the sacrifice of a lamb by Abraham on Mount Moriah, and again in the Passover. Notice also that John the Baptist referred to Jesus as the Lamb who would take away the sins of the world, and the book of Revelation pictures Jesus before the throne of God, standing as if he was a slain lamb.
7. But in the mean time, until that redeemer came, they would have to die, and their disembodied souls would have to wait in Sheol.
8. Both the wicked and the righteous went to Sheol. This is where Samuel went, and the Necromancer at Endor disturbed him from his rest in Sheol to inquire about the fate of Saul the next day in battle. Samuel shows that he was not totally unconscious in Sheol. He was aware of what was happening in Israel, and knew what was going to happen to Saul the next day. Moses and Elijah appeared with Jesus in a transfigured form on the mount of transfiguration. They were aware of what was happening, and discussed with Jesus his impending death on the cross. Luke 16 gives an accurate representation of Sheol or Hades, which shows that both the righteous and wicked were in the Hadean realm, but were separated by a great divide. The good part of Hades was called Abraham's bosom. If we say that Luke 16 does not provide an accurate picture of Hades, then we are charging Jesus with misrepresenting it in his teaching. It does not matter if it is a parable or not. All of Jesus' teaching, whether parabolic or regular discourse, represented the true nature of things. Jesus never distorted or twisted or misrepresented reality. And, by the way, who is the creator of heaven and earth and the underworld? There is no one who would know the true nature of the Hadean realm as well as the Creator. Surely we do not want to charge the Creator of Hades with misrepresenting the nature of Hades, do we? This means that Luke 16 must accurately represent the Hadean realm. If so, then the ideas of soul sleep and Annihilationism would seem to be discredited.
9. So, in the Old Testament before Christ, when people died, their bodies returned to dust, and their disembodied souls went to Sheol (or Hades). Both the wicked and the righteous went to Sheol, and they were held there until the coming of the Son of Adam to redeem them.
10. I think you can see from even this little bit of background study in Genesis that the subject of resurrection is not difficult to understand. It is not rocket science, reserved only for the seminary-trained scholars among us. All of us can understand resurrection if we understand what the death is in Genesis.

II. RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD OUT OF HADES (UNSEEN REALM)

1. In the introduction we noted that there are two basic resurrection views within Preterism: (1) the Collective Body, and (2) the Individual Body.
2. Neither of these two views are monolithic. Each of them have variants in the details. Within the CB View there are differences in the way they handle the various texts (e.g., Max King, Don Preston, Dave Green, and Sam Frost's former view). There is similar variation within the IB View (e.g., the rapture view and the non-rapture view).
3. Within the CBV camp, there are differences over whether the collective body idea is found in all resurrection texts, or just some of them. Plus there are differences over whether we Christians today on earth already have our "immortal bodies now" and are in "heaven now," or whether it is just covenantal, symbolic, or spiritual-positional language.
4. Likewise, within the IBV camp there are some differences. Almost all of the Individual Body advocates agree that most (if not all) of the resurrection texts are dealing with the individual resurrection of dead disembodied saints out of Hades, but they differ on how the resurrection event affected the living and remaining saints. For instance, some of the IBV advocates (like me), believe the living and remaining saints were "changed" into their new immortal bodies at the resurrection, and then caught up with the resurrected dead to be with Christ forever afterwards. However, others within the IBV camp would spiritualize that bodily change and say that it was merely a soteriological effect giving the saints the right to receive their new immortal bodies at their death later.
5. We also need to note that the IBV does not explain the resurrection in the same way as traditional futurism. When futurists talk about resurrection, they usually mean **resurrection of the body out of the grave**. They believe that their selfsame original physical bodies are reassembled, reanimated, and rejoined to their souls -- and then CHANGED into immortal bodies. This means that their bodies would be raised still mortal, and then changed into immortal. This idea was expressed in the creeds as "**resurrection of the flesh**" or "**resurrection of the body**." However, neither of those two expressions are found in the Bible. They were derived from the more materialistic concepts of the Roman Church, as a result of Greek and Roman philosophical influence. The Bible instead uses the phrase, "**resurrection of the dead**." The difference may seem rhetorical or academic at first glance. However, there is a big difference between **raising a corpse out of the ground**, versus **raising a disembodied soul out of Hades**. The most common concept among futurists (especially Roman Catholics) is that the self-same body is raised out of the tomb, and then changed into an imperishable and immortal form. However, there are a significant number of other futurists (e.g., Anglicans, Episcopalians, and Evangelical Free Church) who lean toward the idea of souls being raised out of Hades to put on a new immortal form, which is not the self-same physical body, but a new imperishable body like Christ's. Murray Harris is a good example of a futurist who takes this approach. The difference we Preterists would have with his view, obviously, is in the timing. He believes the resurrection is still future, while we would place it in the first century at the Parousia. But the concept is the same, regardless of the timing issue.

6. My particular position within the Individual Body View challenges both the CB and the IB views:
 - Challenge to CBV -- We are obviously NOT in our new **immortal bodies now**, nor are we in **heaven now**.
 - Challenge to IBV -- 1 Cor 15:51-54 clearly teaches that both the living and the dead saints **received their new immortal bodies at the resurrection event** (the Parousia). This means that we either have to believe that all saints after AD 70 get their immortal bodies immediately at conversion, or it means that only those who remained alive until the Parousia received their new immortal bodies at the resurrection event. That is the key issue within the IB view.
7. In this lesson, I am contrasting the two major resurrection views within Preterism (the Collective Body View, and the Individual Body View), plus showing how the Individual Body View interprets some of the major resurrection texts.
8. I want to emphasize the point that the Individual Body View is significantly different than the Futurist view.
9. The basic position I am following here is: **a resurrection of disembodied souls out of Hades**, NOT a resurrection of decayed corpses out of the graveyards. The difference between these concepts is significant, especially for Preterists.
10. I do not know of a single Full Preterist who would take the corpse resurrection view, and for obvious reasons: as far as we know, no bodies came out of the graves in AD 70. The tombs are still occupied. But there is Biblical and Historical evidence to support the idea that at the Parousia, the disembodied souls of the dead were raised out of Hades, judged, and sent to their respective eternal destinies -- all of which occurred in the unseen realm, invisible to humans alive on earth.
11. The point of all that discussion about death and Hades, is that the dead were in the underworld in a conscious state, waiting until a Saviour would come to redeem them back from the disembodied realm, and give them new immortal bodies, and take them to heaven to dwell with God. So, the resurrection of the dead was a rescue of the disembodied souls of the righteous dead out of Hades.
12. The resurrection of the dead is not talking about raising decayed corpses out of the ground. They have returned to dust permanently. It is NOT a resurrection of the **flesh**, nor a resurrection of the **body** as the creeds of the futurists affirm, but rather a resurrection of the DEAD ONES out of the Hadean realm.
13. Jesus is the only one who could ever get his self-same body back, and that was because He was sinless, his body was never corrupted by sin, therefore death could not hold his soul in Hades, nor could his body suffer decay (Acts 2:27).
14. Jesus said repeatedly that Satan had nothing on him (John 14:30). No one could convict him of sin (John 8:46). He had life within Himself (i.e., immortality), just like the Father did (John 5:26). No one could take it away from Him, He had the power to lay it down, and the power to pick it back up again (John 10:17-18). He had the keys to death and Hades (Rev. 1:18). No other man could say any of this. Only the sinless Son of God had this kind of immortal body. It could NOT return to dust. He is the only one who could ever permanently get his selfsame body back in which to live in heaven. His resurrected body was probably glorified at the Resurrection or Ascension, but it still has to be the selfsame body regardless.

15. The rest of us have sinned. Our bodies are mortal, subject to death, and destined to die and return to dust. And our souls would be eternally doomed to the Second Death (Gehenna or the Lake of Fire -- Rev. 20:14; 21:8) unless a redeemer had come to rescue us from the eternal condemnation and separation that we deserved. Jesus is that sacrificial lamb who died in our place. Those who are "in Christ" have "died with" Christ in his sacrificial death on the Cross, and were also "raised with" him. If we are "in Christ" we are no longer subject to Hades and the Second Death. Death no longer has any power over us to condemn us and separate us.
16. Jesus was the promised "Son of Adam" who crushed the head of the serpent or Satan (Gen. 3:15; Rom. 16:20). He plundered Sheol of its prized possessions and destroyed the works of the Devil (1 Jn. 3:8; Heb. 2:14; Acts 26:18; Rev. 20:10). He raised the righteous dead out of Sheol and gave them new immortal bodies (which had been reserved in heaven for them) that were the same kind of bodies as Christ's immortal body.
17. All of this happened in the unseen realm, at the time of the Parousia.
18. There are two other things that were supposed to happen in connection with the Resurrection of the dead out of Hades: (1) the Change of the Living, and (2) the Catching Up to be with Christ. Let's look at the change of the living.

III. CHANGE OF THE LIVING (FROM MORTAL TO IMMORTAL)

1. The Collective Body View tends to put all of its resurrection focus on the conversion experience and its "dying with" and "rising with" Christ. But their dying and rising with Christ spiritually and covenantally was only the pledge of their inheritance, not the reality of it. We can see that more clearly in the case of Adam and Eve. The death of the sacrificial lamb on their behalf was only a pledge of their actual inheritance to be given later at the resurrection and judgment. The full inheritance was to go to Heaven in their new immortal bodies. That fullness would only be given to those who had "**died with**" the Lamb and had "**put on**" his life. This resurrection would not come until the Parousia, when the dead disembodied souls of those who "died with the Lamb" would be raised out of Sheol and "put on" their new skins that were like the immortal body of the Lamb. What most people miss here, is that both the living and dead saints would receive their new immortal bodies at the Parousia and go to heaven. The new immortal bodies were not just given to the resurrected dead saints. The same kind of immortal body and entrance into heaven was given to all those who were in Christ, whether living or dead. Let's look at the texts which show that the living were changed also:
2. **1 John 3:2** -- "we shall be like Him" -- John tells those who would still be alive at time of the Parousia that they would be changed to "be like Him", because they would "see him as he is ... when He appears."
3. **The Individual Body View of 1 Cor. 15:50-54:** Note what Paul says in verse 50, "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom" (flesh and blood or corruptible bodies cannot inherit incorruption, immortality, nor dwell in heaven) -- This means that the corruptible mortal bodies of the living saints would either have to die at the

Parousia, or be changed in order to get their new bodies. In verse 51, Paul clearly decides in favor of the "change" idea, since he says that not all of those alive at the time he is writing (AD 57) would die. Some of them standing there would still be alive at the time Christ returned. In verse 52 he says that the dead would be raised (and receive their new bodies), while **the living would be changed** (into their new bodies). When was this resurrection and change going to occur? "in a moment, in the twinkling of eye, at the last trump." The change would not occur at their death years later. It would occur instantaneously at the Last Trumpet. Therefore, the living saints would not have to die to receive their new bodies. Their mortal corruptible bodies would be changed into incorruptible immortal bodies. This change of bodies would occur at the moment (twinkling of an eye) when they "put on" incorruption and immortality. Notice verses 53 and 54 where he says that the corruptible and mortal bodies would "put on" on incorruption and immortality. Question: Is this talking about the resurrected dead putting on their new bodies, or is it talking about the living saints putting on their new bodies? How can we know which it is? Easy. The dead disembodied souls did not have a body to be changed. They were not in a corruptible mortal body, so Paul cannot be talking about the dead here in verses 53 and 54. He is talking about the living who still had their corruptible mortal bodies, which needed to be changed by putting on incorruption and immortality. So, verses 53 and 54 are talking about what would happen to the living at the Parousia. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, the disembodied dead souls would be raised out of Hades and given their new bodies, then the living would have their corruptible mortal bodies changed by putting on incorruption and immortality. Paul says even more about this change of the living in his second letter to these same Corinthians. Flip over a few pages to 2 Cor. 5:1ff.

4. **2 Cor. 5:1-4** -- In chapter 4, Paul had talked about the persecution that they were suffering in their "earthen vessels" (4:7) which was referring to their individual mortal bodies (4:10-11). Then notice what he promises to those saints at Corinth who would be alive at the time of the Parousia: the dead would be raised and the living would be presented together with the dead to Christ. Now think about that. How were the living going to be presented to Christ right along with the resurrected dead? He hints at it in verse 4:18 (in the unseen realm). But how are the living going to get into the unseen realm with the resurrected dead without dying? This is the question that chapter five answers. In 2 Cor. 5:1, Paul says that those whose bodies were killed in the persecution already had a body waiting for them in heaven. Then in verse 2 he says that even while still alive in their present bodies the living saints were groaning under the persecution, longing to have their new bodies "put on over" their old ones. This is the Greek word EP-ENDUO, which means to put on over the top of, without taking off the old body first. Then in verse 3, he shows that this is what he means when he says that this "putting on over" does not result in disembodiment (nakedness). When the living put their new immortal bodies on over the top of their old mortal bodies, they do not have to take their old bodies off first and become disembodied before they put on their new bodies! Do you realize how utterly mind-boggling this is! But it gets even more amazing in verse 4, where he explains what is happening when the new body is

put on over the top of the old body. And this verse uses that same Greek word EP-ENDUO (used in verse 2), which means to put on over the top of the existing clothing. Here Paul reiterates the fact that he is talking about living saints when he says that "while we are in this tent." That is speaking of living people still in their mortal bodies, and suffering persecution. They were burdened and groaning in the persecution, NOT because they wanted to die and get it over with, but rather because they wanted to remain alive until they could be "clothed upon" with their new bodies, without having to take the old bodies off first. Then he says that when the new bodies were "put on over the top of" their old bodies, the mortality of the old body would be swallowed up by the life or immortality of the new body. They were changed into immortal without having to die physically. And this "putting on" is a reference to the same "putting on" that we find in 1 Cor 15:52-54, which is likewise talking about the change that happens to the living who are still in their mortal, corruptible bodies. They put the new bodies on over the top of their old ones, so that the old ones are changed, and their mortality is swallowed up by the immortality that is put on over the top of it. *This is profound beyond words. Once you see this, it will bless your socks off. What a reward the living saints got when Christ returned! The dead were raised and the living were changed.* But we are still not through with the change idea. There is one more text in Phil. 3:20-21 that we need to look at.

5. **Objection to the Collective Body View of 1 Cor. 15** -- Before looking at the way my Individual Body View interprets Phil. 3:21, I want to look at one of the objections that futurist critics have thrown at the Collective Body View's interpretation of 1 Cor. 15 --

Some advocates of the Collective Body View have suggested that the Gentile Christians at Corinth somewhat understood the collective body idea in 1 Cor 15, and that it was their incomplete understanding of that concept that Paul is responding to here in 1 Cor 15. It is not surprising that they might have misunderstood it, since it is evident from every chapter in the book of 1 Corinthians that they had big problems there at Corinth. What is surprising, however, is that the Gentile Christians would have understood the collective body view at all, given all the numerous moral, ethical, doctrinal, and spiritual problems they had at Corinth (division, immorality, legal issues, Lord's supper practices, etc.), which shows a very immature church at best. However, as confused as they were about all this before AD 70, we would have expected the events of AD 70 to clear all these matters up for them. After all, according to 1 Cor. 13, when the Perfect arrived at the Parousia, they would "see face to face" and "know fully as they were known." The problem is, we do not see that kind of clarity after AD 70, and none of the pre-70 saints ever surface after AD 70 to clear up the matter.

What we see instead seems to be total unawareness of the Second Coming, Resurrection, and Judgment having taken place. This is not what we would have expected, if in fact they now "saw him face to face" and "knew fully as they were

known"). Not a single post-70 writer shows any awareness of the collective body view of the resurrection, much less a clear understanding of it.

How did they miss the fulfillment? How could they get so confused? Why doesn't any of the remaining apostles (like John) or their immediate disciples (like Timothy, Titus, etc) speak up and set the record straight? In view of the confused and misleading statements of the post-70 writers, the remaining apostles and their disciples (like Timothy, Philip, etc) should have risen to the occasion and testified to what they saw, heard, and experienced at the Parousia. If the Parousia had occurred and they knew it had happened, and they had seen Him "face to face" and now "knew fully as they had been known," then they should have been shouting from the rooftops that the Parousia occurred, and that it happened just as Jesus said, and they saw it, heard it, and experienced it. Why the silence, if they now "knew it fully" as Paul had promised that they would? If the process of raising a collective body of saints out of dead Judaism was the resurrection that Paul is talking about here in 1 Cor. 15, and that process was completed and reached perfection at AD 70, as the Collective Body advocates claim, then why do the post-70 saints appear to lose all understanding of it after AD 70, at the very time when Paul says they would "know fully"? This is a real historical problem for the Collective Body view, and some of their advocates are beginning to acknowledge it. For instance, Preston says:

Stevens is correct to say that we have no [patristic] authors who point to AD 70 as the time of Christ's final coming, the judgment and **resurrection of the dead**. This silence is indeed perplexing ... for which we have no easy answer. ...how in the name of reason did they fail to see that the Parousia had indeed occurred? ...Are we to suppose that the post 70 saints were so ignorant that they could not see that connection? [*We Shall Meet*, p. 286, 287, 291, 299. boldface mine, ees].

Indeed, there is no easy answer, but there is a biblical answer, if we are willing to believe it. And we have seen what that answer is, as we looked at 1 Cor. 15 above.

It requires no stretch of credulity to understand that the disembodied souls of the dead saints were raised up out of Hades and given their new immortal bodies. This resurrection occurred in the unseen realm. They were not raised back into their physical bodies in the seen realm. They were raised out of Hades and given their new bodies, all of which occurred in the unseen realm. Now, let's look further at the change of the living, as Paul explains it in Phil. 3:21.

6. **Phil. 3:20-21** -- Note what verse 21 says: [Jesus] "will transform our lowly body into conformity with His glorious body." This is talking about a bodily change which would occur at the Parousia. This is the same idea we saw in 1 Jn. 3:2, where John said that when Christ appeared, the living would become like Him. And this is the same Apostle Paul who taught this same bodily change idea in his two letters to the Corinthians, which were written six years earlier (AD 57) just before Paul

was arrested and sent to Rome. This letter to the Philippians was written in AD 63 just before Paul was released from that imprisonment in Rome. The transformation here in Phil. 3:21 is obviously talking about the living saints, since the ones getting the change were still in their lowly bodies. They were not dead and disembodied. They still had their old bodies on, and those old lowly bodies were going to be transformed to become like Christ's glorious body.

Another point that we do not want to miss here, is that the living do not have two bodies simultaneously. They are not a dynamic duo. The old body is changed into the new body, so that they only have one body at a time. According to 1 Cor. 15:52, that change occurs instantly "in a moment in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump" so that there is no overlap. There is no moment when they had both bodies at the same time. The change from one to the other was instantaneous. It was not a long-drawn-out process over a period of days, weeks, or years. The change occurred "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump".

Now I can just see the Collective Body advocates waving a red flag here, and reminding us that Paul is using a plural possessive pronoun ("our") with a singular noun ("body"), thus indicating that Paul is talking about a collective body being transformed. This is the flagship text of the Collective Body View. They rest their case on this plural pronoun and singular noun combination. They assert that this is talking about the church as a collective body being transformed at the Parousia, and that it cannot mean a group of living individuals each undergoing their own individual bodily changes.

However, if I said, "When **we** get to heaven **we** will get a new **body**," would you understand that I was referring to each of us getting his own new body, or would you think I meant that when we all go to heaven as a collective group, we will all be a part of only one new collective body that we share in common, like the BORG collective in Star Trek? I suspect you would rightly understand me as meaning that each of us will get his or her own new individual body to dwell in heaven with. And that seems to be the same way Paul is using this language here in Phil. 3:21.

So, if we can find examples of this grammatical construction in contexts where it is clearly talking about each individual in a group having their own individual bodies, then the Collective Body argument for this text collapses. Using my computer Bible search software (Accordance for the Macintosh) I was able to find several examples of this very construction. Paul used this idiomatic expression often in his writings. Here are a few examples:

Rom. 8:16 The Spirit Himself testifies with **our spirit** that we are children of God,
Rom. 8:23 And not only this, but also we ourselves, having the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting eagerly for *our* adoption as sons, the redemption of **our body**.

Rom. 8:26 In the same way the Spirit also helps **our weakness**; for we do not know how to pray as we should, but the Spirit Himself intercedes for *us* with groanings too deep for words;

1 Cor. 15:14 and if Christ has not been raised, then **our preaching** is vain, your faith also is vain.

2 Cor. 1:12 For our proud confidence is this: the testimony of **our conscience**, that in holiness and godly sincerity, not in fleshly wisdom but in the grace of God, we have conducted ourselves in the world, and especially toward you.

2 Cor. 4:10 always carrying about in the body the dying of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus also may be manifested in **our body**.

2 Cor. 5:1 For we know that if the earthly tent which is **our house** is torn down, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

2 Cor. 5:2 For indeed in this *house* we groan, longing to be clothed with **our dwelling** from heaven,

2 Cor. 6:11 **Our mouth** has spoken freely to you, O Corinthians, our heart is opened wide.

2 Cor. 9:3 But I have sent the brethren, in order that **our boasting** about you may not be made empty in this case, so that, as I was saying, you may be prepared;

1 Thess. 1:5 for **our gospel** did not come to you in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit and with full conviction; just as you know what kind of men we proved to be among you for your sake.

2 Thess. 1:10 when He comes to be glorified in His saints on that day, and to be marveled at among all who have believed—for **our testimony** to you was believed.

2 Thess. 2:14 It was for this He called you through **our gospel**, that you may gain the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I asked a Full Preterist Greek scholar [Dr. David Warren, Amridge University, Montgomery, Alabama] what the Greek grammars call this phenomenon when the plural possessive personal pronoun is used with a singular noun. Here is his reply:

You should look in the index of the grammar of your choice under the head term “number.” Usually you will find this subject under “Number, Concord/Agreement in” and then under the exceptions that follow. For Robertson’s large grammar, see pp. 403–409; for Blass and Debrunner, see

pp. 73–76; for Wallace, see pp. 399–406. Robertson calls these exceptions “idiomatic plurals” or conversely “idiomatic singulars.” Blass and Debrunner prefer the term *constructio ad sensum* (Latin = “construction according to the sense”). As for Wallace, he uses several categories (which is a typical distinguishing mark of all his comments): “collective singular subjects,” “compound subjects,” “indefinite plurals,” and “categorical plurals.”

7. Here are some comments from Tim Warner and Roger Samsel (a couple of futurist critics of the collective body view of Sam Frost) back in 2003 when Frost was still a Full Preterist:

[TIM WARNER] [Some] Preterists typically claim that the use of the singular "body" (who shall change our vile body) with the plural personal pronoun (our) indicates Paul was referring to the collective body of believers, "our" (plural) being all believers, and "body" (singular) being the collective whole. This explanation, however, cannot be correct on two counts. First, while "body" is [sometimes] used metaphorically in reference to the Church, it is ALWAYS Christ's body, NEVER OUR body. Further, "vile body" cannot refer to the Church prior to AD 70, because elsewhere Paul calls the pre-AD70 church Christ's body. And Christ's body is not "vile." The only alternative is that Paul was referring to the individual body of flesh....

Secondly, the Preterist explanation [collective body view] is not grammatically correct. The use of the singular "body" with the plural genitive personal pronoun (our) does not mean a collective body. Rather, it is intended to emphasize the application to each and every "body" within his target audience. Consider the following passage:

2 Cor 4:8-11

- 8 WE (plural) are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; WE (plural) are perplexed, but not in despair;
- 9 Persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed;
- 10 Always bearing about in THE BODY (singular) the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in OUR (plural) BODY (singular).
- 11 For WE (plural) which live are alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in OUR (plural) MORTAL FLESH (singular). (KJV)

The last two words ("our body") in verse 10 in Greek are "tō sōmati hēmōn." "To" is the definite article. "somati" is the word "body"; it is singular in this case. "Hemon" is the first person plural genitive personal pronoun (our). Literally, it is "the body belonging to us." But notice that the context [2 Cor 4:7-12] clearly refers to Paul and his companions' physical sufferings for the sake of Christ. "Body" (singular) here is used of each of their bodies, NOT a collective "body" of people. In Phil 3:21, it is exactly the same: "to soma" (the body) "hemon" (belonging to us). This construction with the use of the definite article refers to each and every body

(singular) of us (plural). It does NOT refer to a single body of which all are a part. Here is an example from Jesus:

Matt 6:25

25 Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for YOUR (plural) LIFE (singular), what YE (plural) shall eat, or what YE (plural) shall drink; nor yet for YOUR (plural) BODY (singular), what YE (plural) shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? (KJV)

Since Jesus did not expect the collective Church to wear clothes, He obviously was referring to each and every one in his target audience. In the Greek, Jesus said, "to somati umon" (the body of yours). The only difference here is Jesus used the second person pronoun (your - not including Himself) while Paul used the first person pronoun (our - including himself). The important point being that the singular "body" with the definite article combined with the plural personal pronoun ("your" or "our"), does NOT refer to a COLLECTIVE body consisting of many individuals, but to EACH and every "body" belonging to each those included in the personal pronoun. It is the difference between "each" and "all." Here is another example from Paul.

1 Cor 6:18-20

18 Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without THE BODY (singular); but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own BODY (singular).
19 What? know ye not that YOUR (plural) BODY (singular) is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in YOU (plural), which YE (plural) have of God, and YE (plural) are not your own?
20 For YE (plural) are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in YOUR (plural) BODY (singular), and in YOUR (plural) SPIRIT (singular), which are God's. (KJV)

Here is another example:

1 Thess 5:23

23 And the very God of peace sanctify YOU (plural) wholly; and I pray God YOUR (plural) whole SPIRIT (singular) and SOUL (singular) and BODY (singular) be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. (KJV)

As is very obvious, Paul, speaking collectively to the whole church, uses plural personal pronouns. Yet, because his words are meant to be individually applied, he also speaks to each and every one using singular nouns, like "body," "soul," and "spirit."

Therefore, it is obvious that in Phil 3:21, Paul does NOT mean that the "vile body" is a collective "body" of people. He uses the term precisely as in the above examples, speaking to the whole group collectively, about each and every one of them and their own "body."

It is true that sometimes Paul uses a plural noun when referring to each of their bodies, spirits, etc. But, it seems that Paul typically chose to use the singular when he wanted to emphasize the certainness of application to each and every individual in his audience. When he merely wanted to refer to the whole group without such specific emphasis, he used the plural noun. For more examples of plural genitive personal pronouns with singular nouns, cf. **Rom. 6:19, Rom. 8:16, Rom. 8:23, Rom. 12:2, 2 Cor. 1:12, 2 Cor. 4:16, 2 Cor. 5:1-2, 2 Cor. 6:11, 2 Cor. 7:5, Eph. 2:3, Gal. 6:13, Gal. 6:18, Eph. 4:29, Eph. 5:19, Eph. 6:5, Col. 2:13, Col. 3:3, Col. 3:8, 1 Thess. 2:17, Heb. 9:14, Heb. 12:9, James 5:3, 1 Pet. 1:13, 1 John 3:20-21**. These passages use the same kind of construction as Phil. 3:21, yet in each case it is obvious that the singular noun applies to each and every person within his target audience. In none of them does he use the singular noun to refer to the whole collective group.

[ROGER SAMSEL] Your [Tim Warner] reasoning on the plural personal possessive pronouns with the singular "body" is very correct in my opinion and the examples you cited for comparison are overwhelming evidence to support your conclusion. I noticed something else when I was going over the passages you cited. Phil 3:21 is translated this way in Young's Literal Translation:

"Who shall transform the body of our humiliation to its becoming conformed to the body of his glory..."

What does "our vile body" (KJV), "our lowly body" (NKJV) or "the body of our humiliation" (YLT) mean? The word "humiliation," is the noun form of the verb found in Phil 2:8, "He **HUMBLED** himself..." speaking of Christ's emptying of Himself to take upon Himself human flesh. It does not mean "vile" in the sense of "wicked." It means "lowly," "of low rank," and "humble." In Phil 2:8 it expressly refers to Christ's taking upon Himself human form and became obedient to the point of physical death:

Phil. 2:5-11

5 Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus,
 6 who, being in the form of God, did not consider it robbery to be equal with God,
 7 but made Himself of no reputation, taking the form of a bondservant, and coming in the likeness of men.
 8 And being found in appearance as a man, He **HUMBLED** Himself and became obedient to the point of death, even the death of the cross.
 9 Therefore God also has **highly exalted Him** and given Him the name which is above every name,
 10 that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those in heaven, and of those on earth, and of those under the earth,
 11 and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the **glory** of God the Father.

Just as the body of His humiliation was exalted, so Paul says [within the context of this same book of Philippians] the body of our humiliation will also be transformed to its becoming conformed to His glorified body. This is critical. Since "He humbled Himself" [Phil. 2:8] refers to Christ's taking on human flesh, then "our humiliation" in Phil 3:21 **clearly refers to our physical humanity** [not some status of the collective body of the church]. It means our flesh and blood body that is subject to death. This being the case, there is no getting around the fact that our body's "being conformed to the body of His glory" must find its explanation in the physical resurrection of Jesus Christ from the grave. "...knowing that Christ, having been raised from the dead, dies no more. Death no longer has dominion over Him." (Rom 6:9) [bracketed and boldface clarifications are mine, ees]

8. Concluding Thoughts on Phil. 3:21 -- The point we want to emphasize here is that the "change" of the living saints was an **individual bodily change** which occurred to those saints who were still alive at the time of the Parousia. This bodily change occurred "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump" (1 Cor. 15:51-54). After the change of their bodies, those living saints were no longer in the visible realm. It was like Enoch -- one second he was there, the next second he had vanished into the unseen realm. However, it is not clear what kind of bodily form Enoch had after he was taken into the unseen realm, nor whether he went to Hades or another place in the heavenly unseen realm. The book of Enoch can probably answer those questions. The living were changed into their new immortal bodies and translated (like Enoch) to the unseen realm where the resurrected dead were also. We might also note here that this "change" of the living is the very kind of change that would have occurred to Adam and Eve if they had not sinned. They would not have died, but instead would have "put on" immortality at the successful end of their testing, and then dwelt in heaven with God forever afterwards.

There is one more resurrection text we need to look at, which tells the rest of the story about what happened to all those dead and living saints who were raised and changed at the Parousia. That text is 1 Thess. 4:13-17. Let's take a look at it.

IV. CAUGHT UP TOGETHER (both resurrected dead & changed living)

1. **1 Thess. 4:13-17** -- Critics of the rapture have tried very hard to avoid taking a careful exegetical look at this text. I think I know why. It is the same reason I avoided it for many years. The rapture idea rides on the surface of the text. It is impossible to miss.
2. Critics often find themselves saying something like, "Well, I know that is what the text says, but it simply cannot mean that, because we all know that no **rapture** occurred in AD 70." Do you see the fallacy of that argument? Replace the word "rapture" with the word "Parousia" and say it again: "...we all know that no **Parousia** occurred in AD 70."
3. No Preterist would accept that second statement. You see, if it is okay to let **history trump the rapture**, then it is also okay for **history to trump the Parousia**. But we all know that history cannot falsify scripture. It does not matter what history

does or does not say as long as Scripture speaks to the issue. So our only concern must be what scripture actually teaches about a rapture.

4. Since I have already put together a lengthy exegetical study of this text for my rapture book, I have **attached it as a separate PDF document** along with this lesson outline, entitled: *Exposition of 1 Thess. 4:13-17*. You will want to read that document at this time, before going any further with the rest of this outline.
5. Some points to ponder as we look at 1 Thess. 4:13-17 –
 - The rapture was not a "physical" rapture of the saints in their physical mortal bodies. Their bodies were "changed" first, before they were caught up. When they were changed, they became invisible like Enoch did. Then they were caught up in their immortal bodies. So, the rapture was not a "physical" rapture of "physical" bodies, but rather a catching up of saints in their new immortal bodies after their mortal bodies had been changed to immortal.
 - However, it was a "literal" rapture in the sense that the living and remaining saints at the time of the Parousia were literally (i.e., actually) caught up to be with Christ in the unseen realm, and no longer on earth afterwards.
 - The sequence of events here: the dead are raised first, and the living were changed at the same time as the dead were being raised, and then the changed living were reunited together with the resurrected dead as one group to be caught up together to meet Christ in the air (in the unseen realm).
 - The theme of reunion is critical to understanding 1 Thess. 4:13-17. The living saints at Thessalonica grieved the loss of some of their fellow saints in the recent persecution, and worried that their dead loved ones might not be reunited with them at the Parousia. Paul reassures them that the living saints would not precede the dead into the presence of Christ, but that the dead would be raised first, and then the (changed) living saints would be reunited together with them to be caught up as one group into the presence of Christ. This reunion idea was of tremendous comfort and encouragement to the living saints. But if Paul was talking about a collective body resurrection here, this reunion idea would not fit.
 - The catching up is something that happens to both the living and the dead together as one group at the Parousia, not separately years later as the individual living saints eventually died. This catching up of the whole group at the same time occurred when Christ descended from heaven at His Parousia, not years later to them individually as they died.
 - The bodies of the living saints had to be changed, since flesh and blood bodies cannot dwell in the spiritual realm (1 Cor. 15:50-52). This bodily change enabled them to avoid physical death, and then they were caught up as one group with the resurrected dead to be with Christ forever afterwards. As we saw in 1 Cor. 15:52 above, the change occurred in the twinkling of an eye at the same time the dead were raised out of Hades and given their new bodies. Then both were snatched up together as one group to meet Christ in the unseen realm above.
6. There are many other texts which teach the idea of a rapture at the Parousia. The clearest and most explicit are **John 14:3** and **Matthew 24:31**. A rapture is certainly

implied in both the Parable of the Tares and the Parable of the Ten Virgins. In my rapture book, *Expectations Demand a First Century Rapture* (pages 6-15), there is a list of the major texts which identify what the pre-70 saints were expecting to see, hear, and experience at the Parousia. One of the things that emerges from a study of those "expectation statements" is the idea that the saints were not expecting to remain on earth after the Parousia. They were expecting to be rescued, relieved, and rewarded for their faithfulness, and "enter into" the kingdom of heaven, NOT left in tribulation on earth without a clue about what had just happened.

7. For more biblical support of the rapture, see the list of Recommended Books and Media down below. I especially recommend the PDF lesson outlines on the *Parable of the Tares* (Matthew 13), *John 14 and the Dwelling Places* ("receive you to myself"), *The Gathering of the Elect* in Matthew 24:31, and *Did John Live Beyond AD 70?* You may receive these PDF's by sending your email request to: preterist1@preterist.org

CONCLUSION

1. We have looked at Genesis, and let it define for us the kind of death that needed to be overcome by Christ.
2. As we noticed, the death was both physical and spiritual. The physical death disembodied them, put their souls in Sheol, and returned their bodies to dust.
3. Christ was the Son of Adam (i.e., the Son of Man) who redeemed their souls from Sheol and snatched them out of Satan's control.
4. Christ gave the dead their new bodies, and changed the living into their new bodies, and caught them both up together to be with Him forever.
5. Because of His Return to raise the Dead and Change the Living, we now have heaven and our new immortal bodies available to us immediately after death. That is the whole point of the resurrection event. Since the resurrection of the dead out of Hades has occurred, saints no longer have to go to Hades at death. They instead ascend to heaven where their new immortal bodies are reserved for them.
6. That is indeed a far better hope than the deferred hope of the futurists. The futurists believe that we do not get our new immortal bodies until the future resurrection event. Plus, they are not sure whether their disembodied souls go to Hades or some part of heaven.
7. Which would you rather have, a deferred hope like the futurists, or a fulfilled hope? Notice what Proverbs 13:12 says -- "Hope deferred makes the heart sick, but desire fulfilled is a tree of life."

Recommended Books and Media

for more info about the Resurrection, Change, and Rapture
(most of these avail. from the International Preterist Association website)

Books:

- Harding, Ian. *Taken To Heaven in AD 70*. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2005. <http://preterist.org>
- Harris, Murray. *From Grave to Glory: Resurrection in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan USA: Zondervan Publishing House, Academie Books division, 1990.
- Noe, John. *Shattering the Left Behind Delusion*. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2000. <http://preterist.org>
- Russell, James Stuart. *The Parousia: The New Testament Doctrine of Christ's Second Coming*. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2003. <http://preterist.org>
- Stevens, Edward. *Expectations Demand a First Century Rapture*. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2003. <http://preterist.org>
- Stevens, Edward. *Questions About the Afterlife*. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 1999. <http://preterist.org>

Articles and Papers:

- Stevens, Edward. *Exposition of 1 Thess. 4:13-17*. An excerpt from the exegetical section in the *Expectations* book, dealing with 1 Thess. 4:13-17. Available in PDF format. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2003. <http://preterist.org>
- Stevens, Edward. *The Fall of Adam*. A research paper for one of the courses taken for his Masters degree. Available in PDF by request. Talks about the Tree of Life, mortality vs. immortality, the kind of death they died, the probation period, and the ultimate destiny of redeemed mankind. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2010. <http://preterist.org>
- Stevens, Edward. *The Gathering of the Elect*. An article published in *Fulfilled Magazine*, dealing with the text Matt. 24:31. Available in PDF format. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2008. <http://preterist.org>
- Stevens, Edward. *Did John Live Beyond AD 70?* A study of Matthew 20, Mark 10, John 21, and the history of Apostle John, showing that Jesus predicted his death before the arrival of the Kingdom at the Parousia. Available in PDF format. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2003. <http://preterist.org>
- Stevens, Edward. *Paradise Lost and Regained*. A collection of articles published in *Fulfilled Magazine*, dealing with the Fall of Adam and its remedy through Christ. Available in PDF format. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2008. <http://preterist.org>

Stevens, Edward. *The Rapture – Great Expectations*. An article published in *Fulfilled Magazine*, dealing with the rapture expectations of the Pre-70 Christians. Available in PDF format. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2008. <http://preterist.org>

Media:

Stevens, Edward. *Garrettsville Seminar 2008*. This seminar dealt with cosmology and hermeneutics. Available in both video (DVD) and audio (MP3), including the PDF lesson outlines. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2008. <http://preterist.org>

Stevens, Edward. *Garrettsville Seminar 2010*. This seminar focused exclusively on the First Century Rapture. Available in both video (DVD) and audio (MP3), including the PDF lesson outlines. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2010. <http://preterist.org>

Stevens, Edward. *John 14 and the Dwelling Places*. A detailed analysis of the usage of the Greek word MONE in John 14. Two audio presentations, plus a twenty-page lesson outline in PDF format. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2010. <http://preterist.org>

Stevens, Edward. *Resurrection Studies*. Various audio (audio MP3) sessions over the past fifteen years explaining the Individual Body resurrection view. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2005. <http://preterist.org>

Stevens, Edward. *Parables of the Tares and the Ten Virgins* (audio MP3 lessons plus the PDF lesson outlines). Two of the eschatological parables of Jesus which portray the rapture using the harvest and wedding analogies. Bradford, Pennsylvania USA: International Preterist Association, 2010. <http://preterist.org>